

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants note, however, that the application specifically envisions the possibility wherein Q is a bond — *i.e.*, effectively absent — and if Q is a bond, clearly W would be absent as well. Nevertheless, the claim has been amended as suggested.

Applicants appreciate the recognition that they are entitled to benefit of priorities of their earlier applications.

Restriction Requirement

Applicants appreciate that claims 11-13 and 15-17 were drawn to non-elected inventions without traverse. However, as these claims are directed to methods to use the compositions of the claim examined herein which applicants believe are currently in allowable form, claims 11-13 and 15-17 may properly be rejoined according to MPEP § 821.04(b). Rejoinder is hereby requested.

Double-Patenting

The obviousness-type double-patenting rejection over U.S. application No. 11/367,248 may be withdrawn in view of abandonment of the application. Applicants understand that at the time the Office action issued abandonment may not yet have occurred. However, at this time it is clear that the application is abandoned and a Notice of Abandonment is enclosed.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Paragraph 1

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10 were rejected as assertedly failing to comply with the written description requirement in view of the limitation wherein “Q and W are both absent.” As suggested by the Examiner, this phrase has been deleted from claim 1 and thus from its dependent claims.

Accordingly, this basis for rejection has been withdrawn.

